

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1834.

NO. 15.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Brewery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

Original.

THE TWO CHANCES, A Short Sermon,

BY JOHN GREGORY, SALISBURY, N. Y.

And they said go to, let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. Gen. xi, 4.

After the destruction of the antediluvians by the great flood of waters which God in justice and judgment sent upon them, the Almighty looked down with an eye of tender compassion upon the vanities and imperfections of his creatures who were about coming upon the stage of action to participate in the chequered scenes of life; and therefore sent forth this proclamation: "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth: neither will I smite any more every living thing as I have done. While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease." Here we find the broad declaration of Jehovah that he will not smite the earth again for man's transgressions, but will give the children of men those blessings necessary for their temporal enjoyment; he would cause the earth to bring forth again, seed for the sower, and bread for the eater. The green blade should start anew, the trees of the field should put on their beautiful dresses of green. The insect should hum his maker's praise; the nightingale should break forth into her strains of melody; the great king of day should smile upon the evil and the good, and man should praise his Maker for his wonderful works and for the rich display of his goodness.

As time rolled on these things began to be accomplished; nature resumed her usual course and joy and gladness filled every heart; brotherly love reigned among them, and they could communicate their ideas one to the other, having but one language and one tongue. Thus did these new inhabitants journey on their pilgrimage in harmony and peace until they began to distrust the word of God. They could look around them and behold on every side monuments of their Father's kindness. It was he who loved them with a parent's love and who satisfied their many wants. It was He their Father who opened their mouths daily and fed them from his great store house of infinite goodness. But still in view of all these favors before them, and of which they had ocular demonstration, they began to think it was best to be on the *safe side*, and therefore resolved to build a tower and so get a great name.

Not content with the declaration of God that he would not send another flood upon the earth, they began to design and build a tower whose top should reach to heaven; so that if God

should send rain and deluge the earth, they could climb up their tower and be saved, and if he kept his word and did not send another flood—why, they would be *perfectly safe* and have *two chances* to the others one, who would not fall in with their measures. They appear to have been propelled onward by fear; fear was the moving principle of action. They did not stop and inquire what they were doing—but only let us be on the *safe side*. Had they paused and asked the reason of their present movement they would have saved themselves from much labor and trouble. What! could not the sayings of their heavenly Father be relied upon? Had they no confidence in God? It appears that they had not, for if they had, they would have inquired into their father's character. They knew that he had issued a covenant to the people filled with *Love and Mercy*, but still wanted the two chances—to be on the *safe side*—and escape the dreadful flood which God had said he never would send upon them! O! what blind infatuated people, and what stupidity they exhibited in relation to their father's word. Fear had taken possession of their souls and the distrustful creatures could not believe God to be their unchanging benefactor, nor their best friend. They might have objected on the ground that they thought it "too good news to be true." For in that covenant to the people they saw it was in favor of every child of Adam's race, and perhaps they imagined that there would be some who would become so corrupt that God must necessarily destroy them, his word to the contrary notwithstanding. Because if he permitted them to go on in sin and disobey his laws, others would be tempted to perform the same wicked acts, and therefore thought it would be necessary to *drown* some to deter others from falling into sin's mazy labyrinth. Like the believers in the endless wretchedness of a part of the human family, who imagine that it is necessary to *damn* some of the children of men, in order to keep peace and harmony among the saints in heaven! If God should save all, why, say they, "a God all mercy is a God unjust," and probably a rebellion would follow. They imagine that they could not feel perfectly happy without looking out of *heaven's golden windows* (as the babel builders imagined that they should out of their tower) and see the *red surges of damnation roll over the naked souls of millions of our race world without end*; and that the word of the Almighty that "he will finish sin," "bring in everlasting righteousness," "destroy the devil and all his works," is too good news to be true. Although God had pledged himself to perform this great work, and has sworn by himself, because he could swear by none greater, that by "two immutable" things, his word and his oath, by which it is impossible for him to lie, "that the whole creation shall be delivered from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." But they are disposed to distrust his goodness, and think that some must be miserable throughout the ceaseless ages of *eternity* for an example, to augment the happiness of the redeemed in heaven.

Having concluded to build, they commenced with all possible speed, and for stone they were compelled to use *brick*, and for mortar they used *slime*. You can easily perceive that their materials were not good, for this building was to reach up to heaven; it was therefore necessary

to have good materials, and lay a strong and permanent foundation. We will now suppose that while they are busy with this tower, a man comes along and asks the use of this building. When he is told that they are fearful that God will send rain and destroy them, and they are therefore going to build a place of security, so they can be saved from the wrath of God and the terrible flood which he may send upon them. But says the man you do wrong in distrusting the loving kindness of God. Do you not know that he has issued a proclamation, saying that he will not smite the whole earth again, but will give his children seed time and harvest, winter and summer, day and night, as long as the world shall stand. Do you not know that he is a God of love and will have all men to be saved with an everlasting salvation? Why, say these builders, we know, to be sure, that he has sent forth such words, but then we think it best to be on the *safe side*! We will build a tower and so if God sends another flood to deluge the earth—why, you see how easily we can climb our tower and be saved, while you poor creature will be lost; and as for your preaching up so much *love* about your heavenly father, I think you must be a Universalist; and allow me to tell you that I do not believe God is good enough to save those who are sinful and wicked. You had better keep away from here, preaching the love of God, or our men will stop work and we shall not be able to get the building finished.

The traveller replies, pray tell me of what use can this building be to you after it is completed. God will never cause the water to overflow the earth again, and it is therefore altogether useless. Why spend your labor for that which will give you no satisfaction. God has said it, and it is done; he is not man that he should lie nor the son of man that he should repent. O! cease building this tower and go and find employment elsewhere; rely on the promise of God, and you will save yourselves from labor and trouble. But say these builders, we are determined to build us a tower, and be on the *safe side* and your pleading will avail nothing. Build a tower, we will, whose top shall reach up to heaven, and we will get us a name if nothing else.

Do you see the analogy, kind reader, that exists between those ancient babel builders and those of more modern date. Suppose that a person should attend the preaching of our revivalists of the day. Hears them declaim loudly against sinners, telling them that God is their enemy, and will cause them to weep and wail in the dark gloomy caverns of hell, world without end. Come sinner, exclaims the master builder, you must go to work and build a tower, or you will be lost forever. Behold, sinner, the tremendous flood of wrath which is about to sweep over your soul! O will you sleep in sin until you wake up in everlasting burnings! only think for a moment how the damned in hell will cry out for the rocks and mountains to fall on them! And do you wish God to turn your enemy, and reek upon you his *Almighty vengeance*? Thus he goes on warning sinners of the dangers (which he says) awaits them in the future world, when he is interrupted by this person who tells him that he mistakes the character of God. Instead of his being a revengeful tyrant, delighting to torment his children without regard to their reformation, He is good and alto-

gether lovely—he asks the cause of their preaching up the everlasting destruction of the wicked—when God has declared that “all the ends of the earth should remember and turn unto the Lord and all the kindreds of the nations should worship before him.” Psa. xxii, 27. Did they not know that God had given a covenant to the people saying, “I have sworn by myself; the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength!” Isa. xlv, 23, 24. Had he not declared unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that in them and in their seed should all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth be blest? and did they not know that Christ Jesus had given himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time? and that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, the ransomed of the Lord (all being ransomed) shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness and sorrow and sighing shall flee away!” Isa. xxxv, 10. *Why, yes, they knew that the promise was universal—but then they wanted to be on the safe side.* They cannot believe God will fulfill his covenant with the people—but distrust his goodness, and instead of relying upon his promises, they limit his power, and say his arm is shortened and cannot save. And those who will not lend a helping hand toward building the [modern] babels of the day, are warned to beware the flood of wrath which they say God will send upon those who will not assist in this great work. Come let us build a tower whose top shall reach up to heaven and when the great and terrible day comes, we can climb up our tower and be saved, while you poor wicked Universalists who believe in God's promise shall be destroyed—thus we have *two chances* to your one! This is the way that they reason; just like the ancient babel builders. They set aside the veracity of JEHOVAH—*trample upon his laws*, and go through the world weeping and wailing like lonely orphans in a barren desert, who are surrounded by wild beasts of every description.

O ye babel builders! I would rather have the promise of my God than all the *brick and slime* made babels which you can erect or invent. I would rather trust in my father's goodness—than to have an interest in your *two chances*. One chance pledged by Jehovah is far better than all the babel chances which can be made by the feeble arm of mortals. Take then your two chances, and go on building your towering babels, until you see of your own *shame and confusion*! Only give me the chance of seeing God's promise fulfilled. I want no better. It is good enough to live by, and far better to die by. But to you who are in the habit of making use of this argument, which I have examined, I would candidly say, stop and consider your ways. Your doctrine must be wrong, for the materials which you have selected in building are bad. You have built not upon that immutable rock which the gates of hell cannot prevail against, but upon the passions of an imperfect God. The chief corner stone you have rejected, with the four fundamental pillars of Christianity, viz. *Love, Goodness, Wisdom and Power*, and have substituted *Wrath, Cruelty, Revenge and Partiality*, in their stead. And when truth makes its last effort in revolutionizing the world from error and superstition, this tower, built by human invention, will be seen crumbling to the ground, and *Love's mild banner* shall float triumphantly over its ruins. This period we believe will arrive and that ere long—when the children of men shall throw their creeds to the ‘moles and bats,’ and will embrace God's covenant to the people. O! thou Most High, grant that this time may soon appear when thy children shall behold the rich measures of thy grace, and the *broad river of*

Salvation flowing from thy omnipotent throne, and be led to serve thee for thy great goodness, and for thy wonderful works to the children of men. AMEN.

Original.

UNIVERSALISM vs. REVIVALISM.—NO. 1.

Having understood that a lecture was to be given at the Chatham st. Chapel against Universalism on Tuesday evening, Jan. 28, (a protracted meeting being in progress in that place,) I attended it hoping to hear something which had never been advanced against the Abrahamic faith and fairly answered by its friends. The preacher's name I learned was Ingersoll. He took for his text, “Felix trembled.” Acts xxiv, 25. He told his audience that “Universalists claimed Paul, who spake the words which caused Felix to tremble as the champion and hero of Universalism, and it would be his object in the discourse to show what made Felix tremble.” I intend in the outset of my strictures to correct a most egregious mistake which this Rev. gentleman made in the commencement of his lecture, and which he carried along with him to its termination. It is this: “Paul preached to Felix of an awful hell for the wicked; this was what made him tremble.” From this remark and other subsequent ones in the sermon of Mr. I. I was given to understand that Felix would not have had “his nerves agitated,” had he not heard from the lips of Paul the direful execration of “endless hell.” I think this is a mistake from two considerations:

1st. There is no evidence that Paul informed Felix any thing about hell (in Mr. I.'s sense of that word,) “he reasoned of temperance, righteousness and judgment to come,” not of hell and damned spirits; not a word is said of them. Felix did not tremble therefore because he was afraid of the popular hell, for Paul said nothing to him about it.

2d. We contend that it was *possible* (notwithstanding Mr. I.'s inferences to the contrary) for Felix to tremble under Paul's preaching though he made *no* allusion to future endless torments. By consulting Gen. xxvii, we shall find it said that the good old Isaac on a certain occasion “trembled exceedingly,” but who can suppose that the patriarch was afraid of “hell's horrors?” yet, according to the premises laid down by Mr. I. because Isaac “trembled,” he was afraid of going to hell. The prophet Habakkuk says, iii, 16, “When I heard, my belly trembled, my lips quivered at the voice; rottenness entered into my bones and I trembled in myself;” yet he says not a word about endless misery in hell. Job says, xxi, 6, “Even when I remember I am afraid, and trembling taketh hold on my flesh.” What made Job tremble? was he afraid of an endless hell? This Mr. I. will not attempt to prove.

The fact then that “Felix trembled,” affords no proof that Paul preached the doctrine of hell torments, so that all Mr. I. said about “that little fellow's [fellow's] flashing eye” and “Felix's agitated nerves,” and “convulsed frame,” and “horrible shaking,” does not convince us that Paul preached endless damnation, or that Felix “trembled” on that account. Mr. I. assumed the ground that it would be altogether *absurd* to think for a moment, that Felix would “tremble” under the preaching of Universalism, and he tauntingly inquired, “did you any of you ever tremble under the preaching of Universalists? (or what they call preaching.)”

We shall proceed to show that Felix might have “trembled” under the preaching of Universal salvation, or as Mr. I. very uncharitably styled it, (with a violent stamp of the foot) “Universal damnation!” Mr. I. told his audience “that he was well acquainted with the doctrine of Universalism, he was thoroughly acquainted with all its windings, and absurdities,

and subtleties.” Very well. He *knows* then that Universalists preach as Paul did, “of temperance, righteousness and judgment to come.” They preach temperance, because there is no pleasure in *intemperance*; they preach righteousness, because “the way of the transgressor is hard,” while “they have great peace who keep God's law;” they preach judgment, not because they believe there is coming a “final day of judgment” as held by Mr. I. but because they acknowledge the scriptural testimony that “God judgeth in the earth, that the righteous are recompensed there, much more the wicked and the sinner.”

Now suppose Felix was a sinner, (and we presume Mr. I. will admit this,) and that Paul in the pure spirit of what he calls “God-provoking, God-dishonoring Universalism” has said: Felix you have broken God's law; you have violated his divine command “thou shalt love thy neighbor,” in the very act of holding me a prisoner; and Felix, I do assure you that you will receive the reward of your doings, and be punished for your transgressions; the judgment of God is coming upon you and your nation for your rejection of the gospel. If Mr. I. “knows” Universalism, he knows that Paul might have said all this, and *more* to the same purport, and yet have been preaching Universalism all the while to the governor. Now the question is, could this preaching have made Felix tremble? We answer in the affirmative, for better men than Felix have quaked and “trembled” at the recollection of their evil deeds. Mr. I. “knows” also that Universalists preach the goodness of God, and he gravely inquires “why did not Paul say; why Felix what do you mean by all this trembling? there is no *hell*, I am a *Universalist*. Horror struck! why God has too much goodness to damn you.”

Paul might have preached the *goodness* of God and still Felix might have “trembled.” The same apostle says “the goodness of God leadeth to repentance.” We presume that Mr. I. would very much call in question the sincerity of any of his converts who profess to have repented *without any trembling*, yet this is the effect of God's goodness, not his ceaseless anger. In Jer. xxxiii, 9, we read, and “they shall fear and tremble for all the *goodness* and for all the prosperity that I (the Lord) procure unto it.” Here the people were to “tremble” for the goodness showered upon the house of Judah, yet Mr. I. thinks it preposterous to suppose that any can “tremble” under the preaching of Universalism, or the Universal *goodness* of God.

Again, Mr. I. “knows” that Universalists preach the *benevolence* of God. This Paul might have done and still Felix might “tremble.” See Acts ix, 6, “And he *trembling* and astonished said Lord what wilt thou have me to do?” This is said of Paul himself, when he was converted to Christianity, and Mr. I. will not surely attempt to show that here was not a display of the Divine benevolence. Paul *trembled*, yet he was not threatened with “hell-prison,” and why could not Felix have “trembled” also, while Paul proclaimed the same benevolence? We remark again that the fact of Felix's trembling gives no countenance to the notion that Paul preached to him the doctrine of endless misery.

I shall in my next examine some of Mr. I.'s queries and assertions. H.

A CONSISTENT PREACHER.

It is recorded in history that during the siege of Jerusalem, that ill fated city, whose destruction and desolation stands as a monument of unparalleled suffering in the history of nations, an individual made his appearance, the singularity of whose demeanor and the terror of whose message, excited very general notice. In the habiliments of wo, bareheaded and barefooted, he traversed the streets of Jerusalem. The wild

rolling of his eye bespoke the maniac, the sound of his voice was unearthly in its character, and the burden of his message was wo! wo!! wo!!! Every effort to stop this herald of sad tidings proved ineffectual. No entreaties could prevail on him to keep silence; no menaces could compel him to desist from this appalling cry. He found no rest to the soles of his feet, no sleep to his eyelids, but while life lasted he continued his wild and fearful cry, woe to the city! woe to Jerusalem!

The use we would make of this character is, to propose him to all who are the bearers of a similar message, as worthy of imitation. He acted as a man who really believed his own doctrine. He saw, or believed that he saw, a tremendous desolation about to overtake that city. He saw the united horrors of sword and famine, about to come upon her, filling her courts with carcases and her streets with blood. In view of all this misery, he could find no rest; with a realizing sense of all these horrors, his surcharged heart found vent through his lips, and his constant cry was wo! wo! wo!

There are those who affirm that they believe in a much greater and severer desolation about to overtake the human race. The subjects of this visitation are not the inhabitants of a single city, but the untold myriads of the human family. Their amount of suffering is not restricted to a few years, the period of man's mortal existence, but to continue through the endless ages of eternity. The nature of this suffering is of the most barbarous character, confining the victim in the prison house of hell, and tormenting him with an undying flame. There are those whose business it is to go through the world and proclaim these horrid tidings of wo to the people. As sincere believers in this tremendous doctrine, we should expect them to present a somewhat similar appearance to the preacher of Jerusalem. But far different is the case. Do we see them in the habiliments of wo, clad in the garments of wretchedness and poverty, or at least indifferent to their personal appearance? Why no. They are very particular in their dress; they must wear the finest cloth, be decked with the best linen, mount a rostrum lined with velvet, apply a white cambric handkerchief to the eyes, and then, with a whining voice, proclaim eternal destruction, endless misery, to undying millions of mankind. Some are so very punctilious in their vestments, that they cannot deliver their message of wrath till they are habited in a rich flowing silk robe. Does the contemplation of this awful picture make them indifferent to food, and absorb every other consideration? By no means. Their appetites are good, and they live on the fat of the land. The very next hour after representing to assembled multitudes the fearful realities of the invisible world, they will calmly partake at the festive board with as much 'sang froid' as if they had been recording a dream, or entertaining their hearers with some 'vision of the fancy.' Does the knowledge of doomsday deprive them of sleep to their eyelids and rest to their bodies? Surely not. They sleep on beds of down, and are proverbial as a class who love to 'take their ease' and enjoy comfort. What shall we say to these things? Shall we say that these men are hypocrites? We should be wrong to make such an assertion; but we are bold to say that they have no realizing sense of the horrors of their doctrine—Endless misery! Who can believe it and make the case his own, and find any rest? It is impossible. Let then those who advocate it pursue the course of the prophet of evil to Jerusalem. Let them traverse the world with the expression and feeling of the maniac. Let their voice be heard day and night, while they proclaim their gospel. Wo! wo!! wo!!! to the world, for the Lord will curse nine tenths of his children with an everlasting curse.—*Gospel Anchor*.

DEATH OF LITTLE CHILDREN.

A large portion of the human family are removed from this world, before they attain to that knowledge of good and evil which is necessary to constitute them moral agents. Yet their departure, however early, pierces the hearts of their fond parents with grief—a grief which parents only can realize. But how comfortable is the consideration that the idea is now almost universally admitted as correct—not only that no punishment or pain awaits them in a future state, but ineffable and endless enjoyment. Whether the parents are Christians or infidels, pious or impious, the dying infant or little child is not thought liable to future woe and misery. Few, if any now, will acknowledge their belief in the horrid doctrine of infant damnation; and none, we believe, presume publicly to teach it. No christian congregation of any denomination would now endure it.

Believing then that all who die in infancy, or childhood are saved, and received by their Creator to a state of happiness, the important question is naturally suggested, why are some infants and little children removed from the world at the early age of unconscience innocence, whilst to others is allotted a more protracted existence, subjected, as is thought, to the danger, not only of forfeiting all the joys of heaven, but of incurring the displeasure of their Maker, by which they shall be doomed to suffer unspeakable and endless torments? Nay, when, according to what are called orthodox views, the Being who thus preserves their mortal lives, foresees, and knows to a certainty, that such will be the consequence of thus lengthening their earthly existence only a few short years? Can it be a kind and benevolent Providence which preserves their lives through infancy and childhood, in view of such a tremendous result? Is there nothing like *partiality* and nothing which resembles *crudelty* in such a procedure? Nay, are not both too palpable to be denied? and can either of them be predicated on the "wisdom that is from above," which is *pure*—full of mercy—and without partiality?

These interrogatories we leave to be answered by the reflecting and intelligent reader.

But we will rejoice that the rigor and terror of human creeds and systems have so far abated, that it is now generally admitted and believed, that the large portion—the incalculable numbers of the human family, who are removed by death from this earthly state in the tender years of childhood, are safe from suffering, and secure of happiness, in a future and immortal existence. We rejoice, yea, and we will rejoice at this approximation towards just views of the character and government of the great and good Creator. It is prelude of a still more glorious consummation.

We will ask one more question, in connexion with this subject. It is the following: ought those parents who believe that such as live to the years of maturity, and come to a knowledge of good and evil, do thereby become liable not only to incur guilt in this world, but to suffer endless torments in a future state—ought they to desire that the lives of their children may be preserved? Ought they not rather to pray most fervently, that God would in mercy remove them hence before they shall become exposed to a danger so dreadful—to an evil so insupportable, and so entirely without remedy? How unreasonable and revolting is the doctrine, and how certainly false, which would suggest the propriety of such a prayer.—*Christian Pilot*.

[The following interesting particulars of the progress of our cause at the West is from the last Magazine and Advocate.]

In *Gaines, Orleans County*.—Br. K. Townsend writes, that our brethren in that place "have concluded to build a house, 40 by 50 feet,

with a steeple, and a gallery on three sides. They have raised nearly the necessary sum—appointed a building committee, and have collected a part of the materials."

In *Victor, Ontario county*.—Br. Townsend also adds in his letter, "I attended Christmas Eve at Victor. The church was tastefully decorated, well illuminated, and overflowing with people; and the solemn and interesting services on that occasion, could not have been otherwise than gratifying to all who were privileged to witness them. The interest excited in that section, in reference to pure Christianity, has not abated, and the cause still continues to prosper." Our worthy Br. Miles, it will be remembered, labors with the society in that place, and was assisted in the services of that evening by Br. E. D. Kennicott, who also resides in that vicinity.

In *Norwich, Chenango county*.—After a tedious delay, our friends in that place have purchased a beautiful and commodious site in the village, and contracted for the building of a stone meeting house about 38 by 52 feet, with a cupola sufficient for a large bell, and a gallery on three sides of the house. The workmen are engaged in quarrying the stone and collecting the materials for the work. It is to be finished by next fall.

In *Bridgewater, Oneida county*.—Our friends here have contracted for, and commenced collecting the materials for a neat meeting-house, near the Corners, about 36 by 42 feet, with a gallery for the choir behind the desk. They have hitherto been supplied with preaching for about one-fourth of the time by the different preachers in the vicinity, and having been refused the occupancy of their portion of right in the Baptist house, have been obliged to hold their meetings in the Academy room and lastly in the school-house near the Corners. They indeed needed a house of their own, which bigotry could not control so as to prevent other Christian denominations from using it when it was not needed by the society which erected it.

In *Adrian, Michigan Ter.*—Br. Comstock of this place writes, "I feel constrained to declare my gratitude to the Giver of every good and perfect gift, that he hath in his gracious providence, sent among us a preacher of his everlasting Gospel, to build up (even in this wilderness country) the waste places of Zion—strengthening her stakes and lengthening her cords—causing her sons and daughters to leap for joy, and filling our very souls with gladness and thanksgiving while we wait upon his ministrations and partake of the true bread of life which is dispensed to us by that devoted servant of Christ, our beloved and esteemed Br. A. H. Curtis."

MARRIED.

On the evening of the 29th ult. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer Mr. Wm. H. Donge and Miss Mary R. Hall, daughter of James Hall Esq. all of N. Y.

On the evening of the 1st inst. by the same, Mr. ISAAC L. PINCKNEY and Miss HENRIETTA LARUE, all of N. York.

DIED.

On the 30th ult. Elizabeth, wife of Stephen Crowell, aged 43 years.

On the 29th ult. Jane, wife of H. P. Osborn, in the 27th year of her age.

The Ladies' Dorcas Society.

Will meet at Mrs. Durrell's 264 Grand-st. on Thursday next at 2 o'clock, P. M. if the weather is favorable, and if not, the first fair day thereafter.

Lecture in Greenwich Church.

Sixth Avenue, foot of Amity-st. Sunday (to-morrow,) Evening, Feb. 9th, commencing at 7 o'clock. Subject, John v. 28, 29. Preacher, Mr. Roberts.

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Saugatuck, Sunday, Feb. 9th; at North Salem the 16th.

IMMORTALITY.

We know so little of the nature of that mysterious principle we call the soul, that the light shed from this source over its future destiny is

but faint and glimmering. That it is something of a distinct and different nature from the body, all that we know of its operations go to prove, and from these we draw the inference that it is of nobler and more imperishable essence. While contemplating its splendid properties, the wonderful effects it has wrought in the world, and its capabilities of still further improvement, we feel involuntarily that it was created for eternity, and that scenes of action and enjoyment will be given it, when earth and its changes are counted among the things of the past.

We would draw this inference from the fact that the powers of the mind do not acquire their fullest maturity until the vigor of the body begins to decline. When the dimmed eye, the failing ear, and feeble step give notice that the time approaches when dust is to be given back to dust, the soul seems to concentrate and strengthen its forces, as though aware that the time of its departure was near, to scenes of higher, more intellectual existence.

Though the mind often *appears* to partake of the waste and decay of the body, it does not follow that it does so; for if the organs by which it manifests itself to our senses are impaired, those manifestations will be interrupted, and the effect to us the same as if it were in reality decayed. We have seen the body wasted to a shadow, every breath pain, and the last ray of life expiring, and yet the mind unchanged triumphing in its strength and looking undismayed upon the world of untried mysteries, which lay before it, testifying in silent though most convincing language, that in the awful change which awaited it, it *died not, but departed*.

We draw the inference that the mind is of higher nature than the body, from its being that which directs, and controls action, which reflects, and reasons, and draws conclusions, in all the business of human life. It is restrained by no earthly barriers, but traverses with lightning rapidity the realms of space when the frame is wrapped in quietude. It sends its unsleeping eye abroad over the universe, when slumber is on the weary lids. It hears melodious voices of other spheres when the auditory nerve receives no sound, and recalls the absent and the dead, to commune with its lonely vigils. It treasures up events as they pass, and on its tablets the records do not fade. It has searched into the hidden laws of nature, though mysteries unfathomable to its ken, mock at the inefficiency of its finite though noble powers. It has brought the lightning from its home in the cloud, and taught some of the mightiest of material agents to become useful engines of labor. It delights in the acquisition of knowledge, in tracing the footsteps of the Deity in the wonders of nature. It disdains temporal ease and perils every thing earthly in defence of some sacred right or principle it deems holy, when all its reward must be that within itself, and the approbation of Heaven. The records of the past show how it has triumphed over torture and death, as the martyr's songs of exultation arose from among enveloping flames.

Surely this wonderful principle is immortal. Surely it is destined to survive the ruins of all that now surrounds it—to live on when suns and systems shall have ceased their revolutions, “*a deathless and eternal thing*,”

“Forgetting what it was to die.”

We believe our Creator to be *all-wise*, and *good* as well as *all-powerful*—and on these attributes of his character, we found the belief of another life.

Wisdom presupposes the object to be obtained as worthy of the means employed to attain it, and the question arises, for what purposes was the “cunningly devised” human frame with all its intricate machinery, its senses, those inlets of knowledge to the soul, created? To nurture powers that must die with it, and call forth en-

ergies that must cease to be exercised, even before they reach their greatest vigor! Or was it designed to unfold and enlarge a principle that claims eternity as the term of its existence, and the highest intellectual development as the object of its being? Are the powers of the mind to find their only employment in providing for the welfare of the body? If so, would the object be worthy of the means used to attain it?

In the natural world, all that dies, goes in its decomposition to sustain something else, and rises in another new and beautiful form. The saddening ravages of autumn, the withered foliage that moulders at our feet, go to produce the flowers and fruits of summer, but what would the perishing powers of the soul assist in reproducing? What would be brought into existence from the ruins of its dissolving nature? If the mind is to die, it dies, and nought is renovated by its decay.

No germ of mind springing up, shall mark where perished intellectual strength, and moral beauty; but it is gone, even as the odor from the flower, scattered to the winds of heaven, and all that remains is the memory of its fragrance.—A belief in, and desire of another existence, is found almost universally, and may be considered as one of the impulses of nature. There may be individuals in whom the desire of continued being may be overpowered by other feelings, but it is usually one of the strongest of which man is susceptible, and the belief of it, however rude and indistinct, one source from which he derives much of his happiness. The Indian, in his dreams of the happy hunting ground, where his spirit is to revel in all that are luxuries to its simple habits, is as happy in the prospect, as the philosopher who aspires in the coming life to be initiated into the “hidden things that belong to God.” Each is suited to his wants, and the light which shines on them both, is light from heaven. If this desire of continued being were given by its Creator, who shall say it was not meant to be gratified? If there be a voice in the soul which tells it shall live forever, who shall pronounce that voice a deceiver? *God is good*. Has he made the mind to appreciate a standard of moral excellence, it shall have no opportunity to attain, to feel itself capable of sublimer joys than it can ever partake? Like the fabled Peri, must it sit at the gate of an Elysium it can never enter, and listen to the music of fountains it can never taste? Do the changes of vegetation, and the insect, bursting from its woven tomb, mock man with an analogy which has no foundation, except in his credulous wishes? Has Deity waked him from the sleep of non-existence that he might twine around his heart the bands of affection only to feel those ties severed abruptly and eternally? *It cannot be. Our Father in Heaven is good! and the soul must exist forever*.—Another sphere shall be given for the expansion of its powers, and objects on which to lavish its affections, who will alike be free from the errors and woes of humanity. Imagination hath not conceived of the fadeless splendors, the undying bloom and beauty of the worlds, which it may inhabit, where death is only known in the reminiscences of departed time.—*Lowell Mercury*.

Original.

AN EVENING REFLECTION.

A few evenings ago as I was returning from the house of a sick friend, my attention was suddenly arrested by the sound of human cries, resembling the groanings of deep distress. As I walked on approaching nearer to the scene of seeming misery. I was enabled to perceive that the lamentations and out-cries I had heard, proceeded from a neighboring church. I walked in, it being about 10 o'clock, to witness with my eyes what had come to me at a distance “by the hearing of the ear.” I supposed that a ser-

mon had just been closed, portraying the “miseries of the damned, the torments of the second death, the agony of a lost soul and the horrors of the bottomless abyss of hell.” In front of the sacred altar about thirty young persons, mostly females, were on beended knees, exclaiming, “Lord Jesus! oh my poor soul! save me from the horrors of the pit! what shall I do!” and various other expressions repeated in a kind of frantic ecstasy, some wringing their hands, others wildly raising them above their heads and clapping them together. Before these misguided youths, stood several middle aged men singing “Glory, glory, glory hallelujah,” continually smiting their hands together with rapturous joy. The hymn ended, the men all kneeled and one of them prayed: he confessed the obnoxiousness of them all to the “ceaseless pangs of an unending hell,” he confessed that if God had been just they should long ago have been wailing in hopeless despair, “tossed on the fiery surges of hell’s boiling ocean,” but oh how ardently did he invoke the mercy of Heaven to “snatch them as brands from the eternal burnings.” The inquiry struck me forcibly, What does this language mean? Why the suppliant in the first place tells the Almighty that He has been *unjust*, and then immediately prays that He will *continue* to be so. Prayer being concluded, and the song “Glory,” &c. again sung, some of the spectators began to disperse, and I left the house.

As I came into the street I fell into the following train of reflections: Oh, can this be the worship of the immaculate God? Is this the religion of the blessed Jesus? John and James and Paul and Peter were advocates of this peaceful and consoling religion, but where do we find the record that they ever prayed to be delivered from an endless hell? This religion teaches us that God is good, unchangeably good, that He is our Father, and that He will eternally sustain that endearing character, then how should we approach Him? in the frenzied agony of fear? in the tremulousness of heartless distrust? Ah, no. Come into his presence with deep reverence and humility, yet with joy, with delight, for He is our changeless benefactor, and the unfailing source of goodness and salvation.

I reflected on the words “Glory” in the lines that had been sung, and the repeated exclamation “*the glory of God is here*,” which I had heard from these zealous revivalists. Why do they think that the *glory* of God is among them? Because a few infatuated victims are groaning and shrieking for fear that Jehovah will damn them! Oh, how times are changed, thought I; when Solomon had builded “the house of the Lord,” and the ark of the covenant was to be brought into it, while the trumpeters and singers were as one, in thanking and singing praises to God, the *glory* of the Lord filled the house.—Here was the *glory* of the Lord, yea the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud, (2 Chron. v, 14,) but was any thing said about *hell* here? About the “anger of an incensed God”? Oh, no. They praised the Lord, saying, “*For he is good, for his mercy endureth forever*.” Verily, verily, if this method of praise and worship should be adopted in one of our modern churches, the worshippers would be anathematized as ‘heaven daring Universalists.’ And what religionist in this enlightened age could think of giving *glory* to God in one of our “four days’ meetings,” if he heard nothing but the *goodness* and *mercy* of God preached there?

Oh, Christians! ye professed lovers of the truth and the best interests of your fellow men! how long will you quail and tremble under the influence of false notions in religion? How long will ye transform a glorious system which reveals a *Father*, brings “*peace* on earth, and *good will* to men” into a terrifying demon that hurls scath and mildew over the fairest works of the Almighty?

B.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1834.

Lecture in the Orchard-street Church,
Sabbath evening, (to-morrow,) 9th inst. commencing at 7 o'clock. Subject, 1 Peter, iv, 18. Preacher, Mr. Sawyer.

¶ A lecture may be expected at the Callowhill-St. Universalist church every Wednesday evening, commencing at 7 o'clock.

ANOTHER PUBLIC EXAMINATION.

We need not certify to the reader the gratification we experience in every opening prospect of a deliberate and honorable examination of the great question at issue between Universalists and Limitarians. That public attention is inclining more, and more, and rapidly too, to this subject, is a fact beyond dispute. But a few years since, and where would you find a Clergyman of much reputation who would notice this subject in any terms but those the most sarcastic and disdainful. What, reason with a Universalist! Argue with a man of such inconsistent and absurd principles! Why, it would be the height of folly—labor lost—a casting of pearls before swine! These and similar excuses we have heard repeatedly in times past. But it is creditable to the christian profession that with many this spirit is subsiding. Some it is true cannot yet look upon us as *Christians*, but as '*brethren of the human family*' they are disposed to discuss the subject seriously.—Even this first dawn of liberality we hail with joy, for to us it is a strong guarantee that greater advances will be made.

As an evidence that this subject is receiving increased public attention we need only point to the repeated discussions which have recently taken place, and are now in progress, both oral and written. They are emphatically rising up on the East, the West, and the North; and that the South will not 'hold back,' we have strong evidence in the preliminary proceedings, which follow, between Brs. Thomas and Fuller, and Revds. Messrs. Ely and Brantly, of Philadelphia. The promptness and candor manifested by the latter gentlemen, affords a pungent reproof to some of the 'spiritual watchmen' of this great city, (New-York.)

One sentiment advanced in Dr. Ely's letter we are especially pleased with. It is creditable to the head and heart of any christian. 'My design is not useless disputation, nor have I any desire to excite unpleasant feelings.' An adherence to such views by both parties will ever render controversy not only agreeable but profitable. Profitable, for truth is professedly the object of all, and in no way can it be more effectually promoted, than by friendly and candid investigation in this way. Indeed to exhibit truth in its fullness it must be contrasted with error.

We have said truth was *professedly* the object of all. It should be so in *reality*. For look at it one moment. What possible object can be attained by a pertinacious adherence to known error? What are all the petty party triumphs in time, compared with the changeless concerns of eternity? And farther, the most unyielding attachment to error can never transform that error into truth. How important then that rational creatures should bring every energy of their minds, every reasoning faculty into exercise, fearless of consequences to favorite theories or preconceived opinions.

We may here remark on one opinion that appears to be extensively prevalent, in regard to Universalists, that is, if we can judge at all from the sayings and writings of those opposed to them. It is this, that Universalists generally are insincere in their professions—striving for wealth, for fame, regardless of the truth. Now a moments reflection ought to convince any reasonable man that this could not gen-

erally be. We should be unwilling to prefer this charge against our opposers as a body, and yet it would seem to us that if such were the objects aimed at, policy would dictate their pursuit in the reputed orthodox ranks, above all others. There, honors, distinctions, and wealth are almost sure to attend him who actively engages in their measures, especially if he has abandoned opposing ranks; whereas to the Universalist, scorn and biting contempt are too frequently his only portion—effectually blasting his reputation with a vast proportion of his fellow men, and palsyng, in every relation of business, his pecuniary interest. And we have in this one circumstance a strong presumption that they are, above all others, honest in their religious profession.—However erroneous, therefore, we may be in our views, it must be conceded that we are sincere in those errors. And this admitted, we need not point out the course that wisdom would dictate to undeceive us.

The frankness manifested by Drs. Ely and Brantly we hope may be regarded only as a prelude to a still greater liberality towards Universalists. And that the bitter uncharitableness so frequently exhibited in like cases heretofore, will give place to a more manly and christian feeling.

We need only remark in conclusion that Dr. Ely gave prompt insertion of Brs. Thomas and Fuller's first and second letter, in the "*Philadelphian*," (of which paper he is editor,) and appended his answer thereto, from whence we copy it.

The first letter of Brs. T. and F. was published in the "*Messenger and Universalist*," of Dec. 14th. We have thought it best, however, to insert it again that the reader may have the whole together. P.

A LETTER.

TO EZRA STILES ELY, STEPHEN H. TYNG, WILLIAM T. BRANTLY, and ALBERT BARNES, Clergymen of the city of Philadelphia:

Brethren—Of all subjects ever presented for the consideration of man, that which relates to our final destiny is unquestionably the most important. The concerns of time are not worthy to be compared with the affairs of eternity. A few more years, and the present generation will be numbered with those that have gone before us to the world of spirits. And no one who accredits the doctrine of 'life and immortality' can be altogether insensible to the importance of the question, What shall be the future condition of man?

You believe that a part or portion of the human race will be doomed to future endless punishment. You believe that this doctrine is revealed in the Bible, and that the Scriptures not only authorize but command you to proclaim it as the truth of heaven.

On the other hand, we expressly deny that said doctrine is true. We expressly deny that it is taught in the Bible, and hereby declare our solemn conviction, that *you cannot prove the endless punishment of any part or portion of mankind.* And we farther certify that we feel ourselves obligated to believe whatever doctrine can be fairly and clearly established by Scripture testimony.

With these views, and prompted solely by a desire to extend the knowledge and influence of Divine truth, we are induced respectfully to invite your attention to the following proposals:

Will you (or either of you) deliver a series of Lectures in our churches respectively, during the winter, in proof of the doctrine of future endless misery? Not more than two of said Lectures to be delivered each week—that is, one in each of the churches, on any day or evening except Sunday. On our part, we will engage to invite our congregations respectively to attend said Lectures, and to attend ourselves. On your part, we shall expect to give notice after each Lecture, that it will be reviewed by the Pastor of the Church in which it was delivered, on an evening which shall then be named; and we shall also expect you to invite your congregations respectively to attend.

Should the foregoing proposals not receive your approbation, we respectfully offer the following:

Will you (or either of you) allow us (or either of us) to deliver a series of Lectures in your churches respec-

tively, during this winter, in proof of the doctrine of the final salvation of all men? The spirit of the preceding conditions to be preserved.

If it should be inquired why we have specially directed this letter and these proposals to you, this is our answer: We believe you are better qualified to sustain the doctrine of endless punishment, than are any other clergymen of Philadelphia; and we are desirous that ourselves and our congregations should hear the *strongest* arguments that can be advanced on that side of the question.

With sentiments of affectionate regard,

We are respectfully yours, &c.

ABEL C. THOMAS,

Pastor of the 1st Universalist Church.

S. W. FULLER,

Pastor of the 2d Universalist Church.

Philadelphia, Dec. 9, 1833.

P. S. Any reply to the foregoing with which you may be pleased to favor us, may be directed to A. C. Thomas, 132 Chesnut-st.

TO EZRA STILES ELY, STEPHEN H. TYNG, W.

T. BRANTLY, and ALBERT BARNES:

Brethren—The importance of the subject of the previous letter, (addressed to you through the "*Messenger and Universalist*") in connexion with our earnest desire to learn something definite in relation to our proposals, will, we trust, be considered a sufficient apology, if any be needed, for the present communication. Our object is, simply, to be definitely certified of your determination in reference to the proposals adverted to. May we not then, expect a line from you touching the matter?

With sentiments of affectionate regard,

We are respectfully yours, &c.

ABEL C. THOMAS,

S. W. FULLER.

Philadelphia, Jan. 22.

Philadelphia, Jan. 23d, 1834.

To Mr. ABEL C. THOMAS,

Dear Sir—The Letter addressed to myself and three of my brethren in the ministry, in the *Messenger and Universalist*, on the 14th of December last, never met my eye until some time near the 6th of January; when the paper containing it was sent me through the post office. I have not conferred with the other gentlemen, whom you have addressed; and leave them to answer in any way which they may think proper.

With yourself I have some slight acquaintance; and permit me to say, that I entertain for you sentiments of respect. I do not withhold from you the title of *Reverend*, for any other reason than this, that I use it to denote one whom I regard as a minister of Christ; and I cannot acknowledge any one who denies the future punishment of the wicked as sustaining that official character. I am glad that you have addressed me without any other title than that of *Brother*, and I very cordially salute you in return as a *brother in the human family*. Let the withholding of titles be no offence between us. Let us waive all dispute with each other about character, office, and every thing personal.

I decline making the pulpit or any place of worship the theatre of a public disputation; because I think few persons would be likely to become convinced of the truth by hearing alternately two opponent preachers. We might make *partisans*, but I should think few *converts* to righteousness.

I propose to you to publish in *The Philadelphian* and any *Universalist newspaper* which you may select, a discussion between you and myself on the doctrine of universal salvation; on condition that you will first distinctly inform me which of the many prevalent systems of universal salvation you judge to be true. It is to be understood, however, that each editor of the papers concerned may cease from publishing the controversy whenever he may think it no longer profitable to his subscribers. Of course, you and I shall cease from the controversy when we choose. If either of us shall wish to proceed, when the other declines to answer, he will undoubtedly have the right to publish any thing he may write in any pages to which he can gain access.

My design is not useless disputation, nor have I any desire to excite unpleasant feelings. If I could, I should be glad to convince you of the truth of what I believe to be the gospel: for I fear that you may perish from the presence of the Lord forever. I should be delighted could I be the means of effecting such a revolution in your sentiments as would

prepare you to become an orthodox preacher of the gospel. On the other hand, you feel confident that I shall reach heaven; because all men, agreeably to your theory, will be saved.

I have only to add on the present occasion, that no one of our several pieces, if we wish them to be read, ought to exceed two columns in the *Philadelphian*. Yours respectfully, E. S. ELY.

Philadelphia, Jan. 27, 1834.

To Mr. E. S. ELY.

DEAR SIR—I feel not a little satisfaction in being enabled to testify to the frankness and courteous diction of your letter of the 23d inst. I have so repeatedly had cause to complain of the uncandid and ungenerous treatment received from opposing brethren, that the Christian spirit evinced by you is doubly gratifying to my feelings. I freely acknowledge that it is no more than I expected, and no less than I had reason to expect, from a gentleman of your character and standing in society. And I sincerely hope that the time may not be far distant, when corresponding good feeling will be uniformly manifested by all the opponent sects in Christendom, and when an honest difference of opinion will prevent no one from “endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.”

I cordially unite with you in saying, “Let the withholding of titles be no offence between us. Let us waive all dispute with each other about character, office, and every thing personal.” And while on this point, allow me to observe, that, in my opinion, the title “Reverend” belongs exclusively to the Supreme Being—that I do not prefix it to the names of my Universalist brethren, and that I never apply it to man, except in cases where the non-application of the title might be considered a mark of disrespect.

I am sorry you decline accepting either of the proposals contained in the letter of Dec. 14. I am sorry, because I am confident that a public disputation, in the manner proposed, would excite little partisan feeling, were you one of the opponent preachers and myself the other. And more attention would thus be directed to the disputed question, than we can reasonably expect to excite by a written controversy.

You propose a written “discussion between you and myself on the doctrine of universal salvation.”

It appears to me that your proposal should have allowed a choice of questions—because the joint proposal of S. W. Fuller and myself left it entirely optional with you, whether you would deliver a series of lectures in our churches in proof of endless punishment, or allow us to deliver a series in your church in proof of the final salvation of all men.—Should not your proposal have been so stated as to allow correspondent option on my part?

Moreover, you say, “I should be glad to convince you of the truth of what I believe to be the Gospel I should be delighted could I be the means of effecting such a revolution in your sentiments, as would prepare you to become an orthodox preacher of the gospel.” In view of this statement, the proper question would be, “Is the doctrine of endless punishment taught in the Bible?”

If this question should not meet your approbation, I propose annexing thereto the following: “Or does the Bible teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?” This joint question would, I apprehend, as equally divide the affirmative labor as either of us could desire.

In relation to “which of the many prevalent systems of universal salvation” I “judge to be true,” I need only observe, that I believe the Bible furnishes no evidence of a punishment beyond the present life. I doubt not you will inform me, with equal frankness, whether you predicate endless pun-

ishment on the sins of this life, or on endless sinning.

On your part, you have proposed *The Philadelphian* as a medium of communication. On my part, I propose the *Messenger and Universalist*.—You are editor of the former, and I am one of the editors of the latter. It is of course understood that both sides of the controversy shall appear in both papers. I perfectly agree with you, “that no one of our pieces, if we wish them to be read, ought to exceed two columns in the *Philadelphian*.” And as to the length to which the controversy may be protracted, I shall have no objection to any equitable arrangement.

In concluding this letter, I shall adopt your own language. “My design is not useless disputation, nor have I any desire to excite unpleasant feelings.”—I have no wordly interest to subserve by advocating the doctrine of Universalism. I solemnly believe it to be the truth of God, and feel myself bound to bring into exercise my every energy in its proclamation and defence. And I am strengthened and encouraged in the labor of love, by an unwavering confidence, that even my opposing brethren shall not “perish from the presence of the Lord forever.” In them I behold the ransomed of the Lord. In them I recognize the children of our common Father. And I rejoice in believing that the whole race of mankind shall eventually bow to the life-giving sceptre of the Prince of Peace.

Yours respectfully,
ABEL C. THOMAS.

A REASON FOR SHARP REBUKE.

The frequency with which we find it necessary to call up in review the conduct of religious opposers, to many may seem to call for some explanation of our more especial motives therein. Those however, who have followed the *Messenger* from its commencement, we confidently trust can bear witness that we have constantly contended for ‘principles,’ more than mere ‘profession.’ We have adopted a specific title, or profession, it is true—we have unfurled the broad banner of Universalism. Not, however, through any feeling of exclusiveness, but simply as a designation, and through a full conviction that that sentiment contains the true elements of religious freedom—that it is in fact only another name for genuine christianity as it came from the hands of its divine founder, and may therefore, with the greatest propriety, be used in contradistinction to the many classes under the christian profession who evidently possess its principles ‘only in part.’

Universalism, we do not dispute, may be abused—may be unworthily professed, but then this is not the fault of the doctrine. Whatever evils may arise, or whatever inconsistencies may appear, grow out of the hypocrisy of the professor, not out of the doctrine professed. And few even of opposers would seriously complain of the effects of Universalism, whenever and wherever its great leading principles are practiced upon.

As we recognize in the doctrine of Universalism (or christianity) universal freedom and philanthropy, so has it been our aim to contend earnestly for these great principles, regardless of party considerations. We have before said—we repeat it—we estimate no man by his mere profession. If he manifests the spirit of kindness, of charity, of brotherly love, it matters us little to which of the various professions in christendom he attaches himself—he is not far from the kingdom of heaven. But it is that spirit of exclusiveness which arrogates to itself, all honesty and virtue, that we would oppose. That selfishness which grasps at, not only all the enjoyments and honors of time, but would even monopolize all the

joys of heaven, and eternity itself, for a few favorite ones.

Every thing, therefore, that seems calculated to produce, or foster this partiality, we feel justified in opposing, as at direct variance with every principle of the gospel of Christ—yea, duty requires that it should be unqualifiedly condemned. And hence we repeatedly feel called upon to censure in no measured terms the partial and proscriptive conduct of our opposers. To hold up their practices to the world, that men may view them, and perceive thereby, to what a state of society we should soon arrive, were there nothing to check fanatics in their career. Thanks be to God there is a boundary to the tide of fanaticism—a point beyond which if its destructive waves presume to go, its power is prostrated, and when the good sense and judgment of men will admonish in a voice of thunder.

Among cases of recent occurrence we know a few requiring severer rebuke than one at the Chat-ham-street Chapel last week. After the preacher had got through with what was singularly denominated a Sermon, he commenced his fanatical rant of inviting his auditors up to the anxious seats, &c. Come out there, (says he) come out woman! never mind your husband! don’t be afraid of your husband! If he frowns, let him frown! you had better be on God’s side, than on your husband’s side!—I know many women who would come up at once to be prayed for, but they are afraid!—They are afraid of their husbands; *They are afraid their husbands will be revenged on them!* or language to this effect; and this farce repeated too, for two or three evenings.

Oh, how lost to all the requirements of the Gospel, and all sense of christian benevolence, must that man be who can stand up before the world and thus madly hurl discord and contention into the domestic circle. If he thus feels the hazardous situation of men, why not go to the head of the family, and there preach his terrors of hell torments with all the zeal and fervor that the individual will submit to, and if he please through him to his companion, but above all things let him not stigmatize the peaceful religion of our blessed Redeemer in thus making it a means of arraying the wife against her husband.—Such conduct, of all other, is the most despicable. We recoil, and justly too, at the conduct of the libertine who invades the sanctuary of domestic peace and by his arts and wiles blasts its happiness forever. But in what infinitely greater abhorrence should we hold the conduct of him who can ‘steal the livery of heaven’ in which to alienate the affections and confidence of the wife from the husband.

If these sentiments are deemed severe, in the language used recently by a ministering brother in the desk, we say, ‘It is nothing but their naked truth that constitutes their severity.’ We would, were it possible, have every husband deeply and earnestly weigh this thing, and promptly discountenance by every means in his power, practices which, if unchecked, will inevitably prove the grave of all domestic enjoyment. Yea, and we would to heaven that wives also would reflect deeply on it, and not suffer their apprehensions to be wrought upon by the horrid pictures of these zealots; and then we feel certain they would promptly rebuke such insults to their sex.

We know that a very limited success, compared with the exertions, attends these efforts now, particularly at the Chapel, but then a whole life of penance of such a person could not atone for the destruction of the peace of even one family. Let each and all of us therefore, look to it, and show decidedly by our conduct, that the sacred garb of religion affords no excuse for an open violation of the plainest requirements of social life.

AFFAIRS IN PHILADELPHIA.

In another part of this paper will be found certain communications concerning a proposed discussion of important questions. I do most heartily rejoice in the Lord, that there is now a prospect of bringing 'the things that belong to our peace' before the citizens of Philadelphia. And I know not how to express the satisfaction I feel, in testifying to the Christian treatment received thus far from Drs. Ely and Brantly. I have noticed this particular in my last letter to the former, and would now repeat to the latter, that 'it is no more than I had reason to expect from a gentleman of his character and standing in society.' Long may this state of good feeling continue. Long may we practically regard the testimony of our Savior—'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.'

The first notice of the Letter published in the 'Messenger and Universalist' of Dec. 14, was from the pen of Dr. Brantly, editor of the 'Religious Narrator.' The following is a copy:

"A Challenge.—The following article [the first letter of Drs. T. and F.] taken from the 'New-York Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist,' has been sent to the editor of the 'Religious Narrator,' as one of the persons addressed. The style is respectful and serious, and certainly deserves a serious reply. The editor of the Narrator has had no opportunity to confer with the gentlemen addressed in connexion with himself, and is therefore unable to say what their mind is touching the matter. For himself he is prepared to say that the doctrine impugned by *Universalists*, is one which he believes, as he judges, for sufficient reasons. He once hesitated on the point; and endured a term of the most anxious vacillation; but his maturer reflections, and the most critical examination of the word of God, have placed him for many years beyond doubt; and he feels prepared to assert and vindicate what appears to him the ways of God."

Soon after the appearance of the above article, Br. S. W. Fuller and myself addressed a note (which will be found in another column) to the four clergymen therein named. This morning, Jan. 31, the following letter was received from Dr. Brantly:

"Philadelphia, Jan. 30, 1834.

"Rev. A. C. THOMAS—

The communication signed by yourself and S. W. Fuller has been before me for a few days, and I now reply. As to myself, I feel no hesitation in entering into the discussion of the subject which you propose for debate; but I am not at liberty to act in such a case, except on the *defensive*. The doctrines which I believe and preach I am willing at any time to defend in my own pulpit, but should not feel, at any time, that I should go from home in quest of objections. Should my Church, therefore, approve of the course, it will be agreeable to me to hear you state your sentiments in regard to *universal salvation*, in the meeting house of the First Baptist Church, 2d Street, and afterwards to examine and criticise those sentiments in my own way, and time. Our house, however, will not be tenable for two months to come. With due respect,
W. T. BRANTLY."

The following is a copy of the reply to the foregoing:—

"Philadelphia, Jan. 31, 1834.

"Rev. W. T. BRANTLY,

Dear Sir—Your kind letter, dated yesterday, is now before me. I am much pleased to learn that it 'will be agreeable to you to hear' the doctrine of Universalism stated in 'the meeting house of the First Baptist Church.' We sincerely hope that your Church will approve the course. And we hereby respectfully desire you to present to the session thereof, the joint request of Br. S. W. Fuller and myself, for the use of your meeting house so soon as it shall be tenable.

I cannot close this letter without expressing a regret, that you do not feel free to deliver a series of Lectures in our Churches in proof of the doctrine of endless punishment. Our congregations have a de-

sire to hear 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' They firmly believe in the final reconciliation of all things—yet they are willing and anxious to hear the strongest arguments in proof of the contrary sentiment. And what place so suitable as their own meeting houses? There they have long listened with tearful gratitude, to the 'good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people.'—There they have praised the Lord in the sweet songs of Zion. There they have prayed in faith, nothing doubting. There parents have looked on their children, and rejoiced in believing that these precious pledges of their love were the *certain* 'heritage of the Lord.' There they have beheld, by faith's unclouded eye, the period when 'God shall be all in all.' And there, in a word, they have enjoyed the sweet influences of the Comforter, in believing the testimonies of the *spirit of truth*.

And now, dearsir, you solemnly believe our congregations have been deceived. You believe they are exposed to unspeakable torments in the future state. You believe yourself competent to dissipate the thick cloud of error in which they are enveloped, and to convince them of the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment. What place, then, so becoming your labors as the houses in which our congregations are wont to assemble? What place in which you could reasonably expect more Universalists as auditors?

But I will not press this subject. I could not feel freedom to say less than I have said, and I humbly hope you will not take amiss the expression of the feelings and views of,
Respectfully yours,

ABEL C. THOMAS."

Our readers will of course understand, that we shall apprise them of every thing connected with the matter in hand. We indulge a hope that much good will be effected in Philadelphia, by the free discussion of the questions adverted to.

I will close this article by mentioning, that the 'First Baptist Church' in Philadelphia, is the one from which ELHANAN WINCHESTER was ejected for embracing and preaching the doctrine of Universalism. See an account of the whole affair, in the preface to 'Winchester's Dialogues.' A. C. T.

THE STANWICH DISCUSSION.

Since our last we have learned that the Presbyterian Meeting House in Stamford, Conn. has been obtained, in which to continue the discussion between Br. S. J. Hillyer, and Rev. T. Payne, which was postponed at Stanwich, for the want of a house. The discussion, it is expected, will be resumed immediately. Br. Hillyer is now waiting to learn from Mr. Payne, when it will be convenient for him to commence again. It will probably be resumed within a week or two. P.

The following Obituary was recently put into my hands by a friend. It was transmitted to the editor of the Philadelphia "Saturday Evening Post" for publication, and by him rejected. It was thrown among other rejected articles, and swept out. It was picked up and preserved by a young gentleman, who was not willing that so touching an account of one of the faithful in Christ should be entirely lost. I have been at the trouble of transcribing it for publication—correcting a few trifling inaccuracies in composition. I hope the length of the article will prevent no one from perusing it.—Let us be truly thankful that the light of the salvation of the Lord, hath dawned upon the minds of many of his children in the far-off West—and let us fervently pray that tens of thousands may rejoice as did Alzina, in believing the testimonies of the word of truth.

OBITUARY.

Died, on the 23d —, in the vicinity of Troy, Missouri, Miss ALZINA COTTLE, aged 27, eldest

daughter of Mr. Andrew Cottle. She had for several years been a steadfast believer in the universal and unchangeable love of God, and in the consequent restitution of all things. She continued unwavering to the last, and her faith was evidently genuine, as it wrought by love, purified the heart, and brought forth the fruits of righteousness, joy, and peace in her life—comfort and consolation in her sickness—removed all doubts and fears respecting futurity—disarmed death of his sting, and lit up her countenance with cheerful smiles. Sometimes during her sickness, she would break forth in the song of the angels—"Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men." A short time before her exit, her attendants heard her singing part of her favorite hymn:

"Let us love our Lord supremely,
Let us love each other too;
Let us love our fellow creatures,
Till our Lord makes all things new.

"When we all get home to heaven,
At his table we'll sit down;
Christ will then come forth and serve us
With sweet manna all around."

She called the family to her bed side—gave them good counsel, and said "weep not for me; I am going home to our good Father; our separation will be short; we shall soon meet again, to part no more forever. There I shall meet all my Father's children—not one of them will be missing." She often expressed a fervent desire to depart and be with Christ. When her breath began to fail, her soul was so filled with love and joy, that it burst from her lips—"Glory to God in the highest—O love—love—love; O glorious hope, glorious hope of immortality"—and then her freed spirit returned with rejoicing to God who gave it. One of the neighbors said to me, "if any have doubts whether this faith will do to die by, let them doubt no more—for I think they ought to be satisfied that it will do both to live by and die by—for Alzina has shown us both how to live and how to die."

Thus died Alzina in the triumphs of faith—another striking instance and evidence, that those enlarged views of the character and attributes of Deity, as the father and friend of the Universe, will not only through life produce righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, but also yield the strongest consolations in a dying hour.

On viewing the grave of Alzina, situate half a mile west of the town, on a gentle eminence of the beautiful prairie, enamelled with variegated flowers, the words of the poet recurred to my mind:

"I have often thought that flowers were the alphabet of angels, whereby they write mysterious truths on hills, fields and prairies."

"She sleeps the quiet sleep of death,
The maid who lies below,
And these are angel-missioned flowers,
That o'er her green turf grow.

And they are sent to warn the fair,
How transient is their bloom;
See how they bend their tender forms,
And weep upon her tomb.

I know the language of the flowers,
And love to hear them grieve,
When crimsoned to the eye of morn,
Or drooping to the eve.

They tell of her whose spirit comes,
To breathe upon their leaves;
And can I choose but love those flowers,
On which Alzina breathes?

Yes, I will love those modest flowers,
And cherish them with tears;
They mind me of my fleeting hours,
Yet banish all my fears.

She's gone where sorrow may not come,
Where pain may never be;
But she who lives an angel still,
Will sometimes think of me.

And when my hour of rest shall be,
I will not weep my doom,
So angel-missioned flowers may come,
And gather round my tomb."

May, 1830.

J. C.

☞ A commendatory notice of the "Female Hospitable Society of Philadelphia" is crowded out this week. It will appear in our next.

☞ For Notices, &c. see third page.

A FRAGMENT.

BY I. D. WILLIAMSON, ALBANY.

'Twas evening; and I sat me in the house
Where multitudes in solemn awe were met,
To pay their vows and worship before him
Who lives and reigns in majesty supreme.
The pale light shone dimly from the fading
Lamp, whose scattered rays contended feebly
With the spirits of darkness hovering round.
The aged and the young were there; and all
Ranks from riches down to poor and helpless
Penury, had met in convocation,
To hear from God and worship at his feet.
Patiently and silently they waited
And with anxious look gazed on the pulpit
Where sat the shepherd man whose duty was
To feed them with the bread of heaven and earth
The hymn was ended, and from a thousand
Waiting hearts, the fervent prayers of pious faith
Borne on angels shining wings ascended
The celestial brow, of the holy mount
Calling on God to shower salvation down.

The book was opened;
And from its sacred page, the text was read,
Which spake of punishment for those who stray
From virtuous path, to walk with sinners vile.
But men through mists of error dark, see not
The parent's hand that guides the chast'ning rod.
Like children whose awakened fears transform
The image of their friends to demon powers,
Of whom the nurse has bid them oft beware,
So men, by falsehood blinded and deceived,
See not the smile that beams in glory bright
From the face of him who smites the sinner,
But smites to bless and wounds to heal again.
Thus the preacher, accustomed long before
To meditate on ideal woes that swell
Beyond the vale of death, and sadly brood
O'er scenes of cruelty, in future worlds,
Sees in the text, nought but the burning pit,
And turns the threat'nings of a father's love
To the cruel ire of an angry God.
On the scathed brow of Sinai's awful mount,
Where lightnings flash and grumbling thunders shake
The solid ground, he took his favorite stand.
To the lowest depths of the infernal den
He plunged, and brought up the naked souls
Of men long damned, to unfold the dreadful
Secrets of that unseen world of anguish.
How demons rave, and spirits in chains
Write and burn deep in seas of liquid fire
That roll and dash their boisterous billows
Against the rugged rocks that make their bounds!
With gestures frantic and with looks of fear
He said, that miseries more keen than these
In God's own book are threatened and await
The souls of those to whom his words are given.
His voice he lifted high and cried aloud,
That hell's most dreaded jaws yawned from beneath,
And devils grim had raised their brawny arms
To drag his hearers down the gulf of woe!
Then it was that the stout hearted trembled
And the nerves of the weak and timid shook
As the aspen leaf when driven by the wind.
The tender maiden shrieked outright for fear,
And even the hoary headed sire, whose brow
Had often stood unmoved in battles dire,
Was sore afraid and chilled with anxious fear.
And men were in that house, (if right it be,
To call them men, who wear the human form
But have no hearts to feel) and women too,
Who looked coldly on, and even gloried in
The tears that fell from eyes unused to weep.
I turned away and sighed, that men who live
On God's paternal care from day to day,
Should raise a feeble voice against his love.
And at the moment, when his blessings fall
Most freely on their heads, traduce his name.

Gospel Anchor.

FRIENDSHIP.

There is no pleasure in this weary world,
more worthy to be sought for, or which deserves
the name of happiness, more than that which
is to be found in the society of those who have
proved themselves FRIENDS. It is then that we
feel as though we had reached the long-wished
for haven of earthly happiness. But alas! how
few are to be found, who remain truly faithful
to the trust reposed in them! How few are
truly worthy of our confidence! Few indeed
are they who will rejoice with us in prosperity,

and extend the arm of consolation to assuage
our grief in the hour of adversity. Many in-
deed there are, who assume the name, and
extend the hand of professed friendship, with
so much apparent sincerity, as to win our confi-
dence ere we are aware; and we are made too
late to feel, that we have reposed on a broken
reed, and that the object of our regard sought
our confidence, and friendship *only* to betray us
and to promote their own selfish interest. And
when the distressing events of life, and the
frowns of fortune, fall upon us, in which we
need their sustaining succor, we find ourselves
left to feel the pangs of regret, *alone*. But
when we have been so successful as to confide
in those by whom our regard is appreciated, and
in whom we have placed unbounded confidence
without disappointment, who, when in adver-
sity and sorrow, supported and led us to peace
and resignation, then, indeed, we may call our-
selves blessed and happy.

In the possession of such friends, we look for-
ward with hope, and reflect with satisfaction on
past enjoyments; and we feel that even in
this world there is no cup of sorrow unmingled
with pleasure.

In the vicissitudes and changes incident to
human life—in the numerous disappointments
sorrows, and afflictions, which we are destined
to endure, what can cheer the mind, raise the
drooping soul, calm the agitated bosom, and
throw a cheering light on the future, like the
sympathies and kind offices of a dear and much
loved friend? Oh, FRIENDSHIP! thou heaven-
born maid, visit thou the abode of misery; wipe
the tear from sorrow's eye; chase away the an-
guish of despair, and sweeten the cup of affliction
with thine all-soothing balm. And when giddy
youth shall leave the paths of virtue and
honor, to wander on the barren, yet alluring
wilds of vice and folly, let thy healing influence
take possession of his soul, and lead him back
to honor and respectability. When fickle for-
tune deserts the good, and leaves their tender
ones without a home, be thou near to afford the
aid of thy supporting arm, and to offer the con-
solation of thy sustaining influence. And when
mortality shall fail, and the lamp of life does
but faintly glimmer in this feeble frame, let that
blessed hope, which thine influence inspires, be
with us, and bid us wing our way to worlds be-
yond the sun—to live and reign in never-ending
bliss, with him who is the impartial and never
failing FRIEND of all.—*Ladies' Repository*.

HAPPINESS.

Translated for the 'Messenger and Universalist' from the French of
Abbe Fleury.

All men seek to be happy; but honors, plea-
sure and riches never yield true and solid hap-
piness. A thousand cares disturb their enjoy-
ment during life, and in the hour of death we
behold their worthlessness. Piety alone, by
securing within a profound peace conducts
through a transcendent felicity to one that never
ends. It is the hope of this blessed eternity
which tranquilizes the heart, mitigates, and
sometimes even renders lovely sickness, afflic-
tions, and misfortunes to which mankind are ex-
posed. It is the only joy that old age augments,
and which strengthens itself in the general weak-
ness of the senses. A man who has begun
to give himself to God, ought often to consider
these fundamental truths; and he ought also to
be convinced thereof by the testimony and expe-
rience of those who have served God a much
longer time, and I am certain, if he perseveres
in his good resolutions, that he will taste within
himself a happiness from this life, which shall
surpass all that he ever believed or hoped. R.

Friendship demands sincerity, but she also in
common benevolence demands a mutual indul-
gence and accommodation; and requires that

mildness should be exposed to anger, and patience
to ill-humor.—*Zimmerman*.

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER

AND

PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of
the Messenger it is merely necessary to say,
that no essential change will be made in the
course of the paper, unless it be to avail our-
selves of every possible opportunity of increas-
ing the talent and interest in its columns. It
will, therefore, in the language it has ever held
forth, to the world, continue to "plead the cause
of a slandered and persecuted denomination of
Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor
to inspire confidence among its friends, and
to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and
unconcerned, and even opposers, to come for-
ward into the field of examination and "reason
together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a
world's reconciliation to God.

CONDITIONS.

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Phila-
delphia Universalist," is published simul-
taneously in New-York and Philadelphia every
Saturday morning on a royal sheet, quarto
form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, *in ad-
vance*, or \$2.50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia
will be promptly served by carriers, and all pos-
sible care will be observed in the Mailing de-
partment, that subscribers may regularly receive
their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's.
2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and
in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132
Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE, Publisher and Proprietor.

Cheap Pamphlets,

With a variety of Universalist Books, for sale at
the Messenger office, No. 2 Marble Building, Chat-
ham-Square, N. Y.

Arminio-Calvinism, or the story of Dea.

Comfort, &c. 36 pages 6 cts. single

Letters addressed Rev. W. C. Brown-
lee, D. D. of the Reformed Dutch
Church, (in reply to his Lectures
against Universalism,) by T. J. Saw-
yer—in pamphlet binding, 22 letters,
176 pages 25 " "

Correspondence between a member of
the Reformed Dutch Church and a
Universalist, both residents of New-
Jersey, 16 pages \$2 per 100

Christmas Sermon, by R. O. Williams,
Amsterdam, 16 pages \$2 per 100

Female Influence, by Miss J.H. Kinney,
and a Short Sermon, the Kindness
and Love of God, by A. C. Thomas,
16 pages \$2 per 100

Reply to Strange Thing, 16p \$2 per 100

Important Questions, with Scripture
Answers, by Lucy Barnes, 8 small
pages \$0 50 per 100

An Appeal to the Public, and the 213
Questions without Answers, with
which that Appeal is connected, mak-
ing a pamphlet of 48 closely printed
pages, comprising all that has been
published by the Christian Intelligencer
in relation to their public pledge to
answer the Questions, and their event-
ual refusal, together with the remarks
of the author of the Questions, (A. C.
Thomas,) thereon \$3 per 100

We have also the following from other offices.
A Mate to the Temperance Ox, by I. D.
Williamson, Albany \$3 per 100,

50 cts. per doz. 6 cts. single

Reply to Hawes' Reasons for not em-
bracing the doctrine of Universal Sal-
vation, 96 pages stitched \$6 per 100 8 " "

bound 8 " " 12 1-2 "

P. PRICE, PRINTER,

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square,
where JOB PRINTING will be neatly execu-
ted, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.